

STUART SIGNS RICHMOND CHARTER AMENDMENTS

Bills Approved Abolishing Board of Police Commissioners and Health Board.

GOVERNOR SIGNS MANY BILLS

Approves Measure Authorizing Hope-well. After It Becomes a City, on July 1, 1916, to Borrow Money and Issue Bonds.

Governor Stuart yesterday signed the Richmond charter bills abolishing the Board of Police Commissioners and placing the supervision of the Police Department under the Mayor, amending the charter as to the terms of office of the Police Commissioners. All of the bills take effect sixty days after the adjournment of the General Assembly, so that the Police Department will be put into the direct control of Mayor Ansley early in June when the present board goes out of office.

The charter changes also provide for the abolition of the Board of Health and place the control of the Health Department under the Mayor. No reason has been given for the apparent inconsistency of retaining a separate volunteer board to control the Fire Department and abolishing the separate boards for Police and Health Departments.

HOPEWELL ALLOWED

TO BORROW MONEY

Bills were signed by the governor yesterday as follows:

House bill No. 132—Authorizing the school board of Western Branch Maclester District, in the County of Norfolk, to borrow money and issue bonds for school improvements.

House bill No. 133—Authorizing Hopewell, in the County of Prince George, when it shall have become a city on July 1, 1916, to borrow money and issue bonds for public improvements.

House bill No. 134—Providing for a bond issue for bridge building in the County of Isle of Wight.

House bill No. 135—Amending the law of the County of Rockingham, Virginia, relating to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 136—Amending the charter of the City of Norfolk so as to define the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 137—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 138—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 139—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 140—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 141—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 142—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 143—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 144—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 145—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 146—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 147—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 148—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 149—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 150—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 151—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 152—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 153—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 154—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 155—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 156—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 157—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 158—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

House bill No. 159—Amending the charter of the City of Richmond in relation to the duties and powers of the Board of Police Commissioners, and placing the Police Department under the jurisdiction of the Mayor.

Cooking Wine for Hotels

Falling to secure the elimination of the section allowing hotels to keep on hand, under certain restrictions, wines and spirits for culinary and bath purposes, members who objected to this provision secured the incorporation of amendments exempting a large number of counties and cities from its application.

In the following localities hotels will be barred from availing themselves of the liquor privileges granted under this section:

Counties—Smyth, Russell, Scott, Prince Edward, Grayson, Giles, Bland, Prince William, Accotank, Loudoun, Carroll, Orange, Northampton, Southampton, Washington, Mathews, Middlesex, Lee, Tazewell, Buchanan, Henry, Wise, Dickenson, Rockingham, Greensville, Sussex, Floyd, Brunswick, Spotsylvania and Culpeper.

Cities—Danville, Roanoke, Fredericksburg and Lynchburg.

Foundational effort to enact a statute of limitations with respect to the right of the State to collect a debt. Upon what sound theory such legislation can be maintained as either just or constitutional I cannot, for the life of me, see.

If a citizen have inadvertently withheld property from taxation, he has none the less gotten the benefit of his own carelessness, and still has in his pocket money belonging to the State of Virginia. Under these circumstances, the State should not hesitate to collect every dollar of it, but the penalties provided by statute might be too severe.

Where, on the other hand, it appears that a citizen has fraudulently withheld property subject to taxation, the State should collect every dollar, and add thereto every penalty provided by law.

I gathered in Mr. Ryan's case that he had been acting upon the mistaken advice of counsel, and I do not think that in his case any penalties should be added. His case is, however, a splendid illustration of what the Legislature is being asked to do, and which, in my judgment, it has no right to do, and which it ought to be ashamed of doing, if it does.

Let us see for a moment how this situation resolves itself. For eleven years Mr. Ryan, whether inadvertently or otherwise, had been withholding from taxation millions of dollars of intangible personal property which he had in his possession, and which was clearly subject to tax. To the extent that said property was being withheld, the State became a loser of its revenues.

In 1915 the examiner of records for Nelson County, acting under the express mandate of the State advisory board, and in the due discharge of his duty under the law, undertook to discover and assess property which had been withheld from taxation, as above said. Realizing the difficulties attending the task, the examiner employed counsel to assist him, and, after several months of very diligent work and the expenditure of something like \$1,000, the examiner, through his counsel, succeeded in finding and definitely locating sixty millions of dollars of omitted property.

Finally, Mr. Ryan admitted the accuracy and justice of this amount, and through his counsel appeared before the local board and stated that he had no objection to the assessment being made for that amount.

In other words, Mr. Ryan admits that he is indebted to the State of Virginia for the taxes, as fixed by law, on that sum of money. He admits that he is indebted to the State of Virginia. He admits that for eleven years he has had in his coffers money which should have been in the coffers of the State. These are the hard facts of the situation.

That the Legislature should now be asked to make Mr. Ryan a present of several hundred thousand dollars which he admits he owes the State of Virginia, and which, as we all know, he is amply able to pay, is to my mind, nothing short of monstrous.

I have used Mr. Ryan's case as an illustration, simply because I am more familiar with all of the facts and details thereof. But exactly the same reasoning applies to every other property holder in the State who, inadvertently or fraudulently, has withheld property from taxation.

The poor man and men like you and I, possessing only moderate means have to, and I believe do, pay every dollar of the tax which they are due the State. To permit the rich to withhold property from taxation and then enact

legislation forbidding the collection from them of money honestly due the State, is nothing short, in my judgment, of the State aiding and abetting such persons in the perpetration of grand larceny.

Referring specifically to the Ryan matter again, I wish to say that as soon as the assessment in question was made, the State had the right to levy for the tax thereon, if the same was unpaid.

In my effort to have the same collected as early a day as possible, on December 6 I wrote Mr. C. Lee Moore, the Auditor, asking whether or not, in the event there should not be an early payment of the taxes, I could rely upon him as a State officer to insist upon the laws being enforced, and a levy being made, just as would be the case were Mr. Ryan merely an average citizen, and not a very rich man? I am enclosing you a complete copy of my said letter to Mr. Moore.

On December 7 Mr. Moore replied to my letter, and I am enclosing you a full copy of his reply. If he had mailed me a blank sheet of paper with his name signed to it, it would have given me just as complete a reply to my letter as the answer which he sent.

You will see that I have exerted myself to the utmost to bring about the collection of this debt, but I do not feel that it is incumbent upon me to go to Richmond and consume my time and money and engage in a lobbying campaign to prevent the passage of the iniquitous bills now pending.

Under the laws and under the direction of the State Advisory Board, my client did his full duty, and should the State see fit to give away the money which his industry has secured for her, she certainly cannot undertake to deny him his commissions. This would be a crowning indignity which the State officers, in charge of the situation would not, I am sure, consider for a moment.

Trusting that what I have written may be of some service to you, and congratulating you upon your vigorous defense of the State's rights in this matter, I am,

Sincerely your friend,
JOHN L. LEE.

Flood's Reply to Lee.
Washington, D. C., Feb. 18, 1916.

Hon. John L. Lee, Richmond, Va.
Dear Jack—Your special delivery letter was found by me at the Shorham Hotel upon my return there last night. I did not get it until too late to answer it. I am answering it, the first thing this morning.

You will recall that when I saw you here a few days ago I mentioned to you that there were some bills pending in the Legislature which would have the effect of partially relieving all persons, including Mr. Ryan, from the payment of taxes on omitted property. I thought then that you would go to Richmond and look after the matter from Dr. Ryan's standpoint.

The recollection of the conversation between us on January 2 stated in your letter is verbally substantially as I recollect it, but I am afraid you placed a different meaning on my language from what I intended to convey. The conversation was very brief and I was simply giving you information which you had asked me to secure for you.

You will recall that Mr. Ryan expected to settle with the State, and that he would settle in about sixty days. Nothing was said as to the amount that would be paid.

I did not intend to convey the idea that the Legislature should adopt the suggestion of the State Advisory Board and limit the number of years that taxes on omitted property could be assessed, or collected, that Mr. Ryan would not take advantage of such a law, for Mr. Ryan always said to me that he expected to be treated as all other taxpayers were treated—he did not expect any discrimination for or against him.

You will recall that last summer the State Advisory Board published a statement to the effect that it would recommend to the Legislature a period of five years for omitted property and five years for omitted property and five years for omitted property and five years for omitted property.

I went to the telephone to talk to you on Wednesday when I was called, but was told that you had left the phone. I would have called you at Murphy's yesterday, but did not know where you were.

I hope some arrangement can be made by which Dr. Ryan's commissions can be paid. Through you he did the work for the State, and did it well, and ought to be paid.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
(Signed) H. D. FLOOD.

Lee's Letter to Flood.
Hon. H. D. Flood, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir—Your letter of the 18th is now before me.

I cannot tell you how sincerely I regret that any misunderstanding should have arisen between us in relation to anything connected with the Ryan tax matter.

Shortly after my employment by Mr.

Drummond I had a conference with you about the case, and from that time on your fairness and frankness impressed me with your earnest desire to bring about an equitable and just settlement of the State's claim, having due regard to the interests of the State, as well as Mr. Ryan's.

You will distinctly recall, I have no doubt, that when the sum of \$50,000,000 of omitted property was agreed upon, I insisted that some representative of the local board of Nelson and that there was no objection to such assessment. Mr. Coleman, one of Mr. Ryan's counsel, did appear before the board with me, and this assessment had been agreed to by Mr. Ryan, it never dawned on my mind that any question as to the ultimate payment of the taxes due the State, or that such assessment would ever be raised.

I did not know that Mr. Ryan would seek adjustment of the tax due the county of Nelson, and, in view of the payment of our commissions, he would, I felt that it could well afford, and ought to make some concessions in the premises, and so stated.

In a letter which I wrote on December 13, 1915, to our mutual friend, Mr. Walton Moore, one of Mr. Ryan's counsel, in response to a communication from him about the matter, written at his suggestion, my understanding of Mr. Ryan's attitude to the tax due the State was so clearly and explicitly set forth as to render mistake or misapprehension impossible. I here quote from the said letter, which you will observe was written only a few days over two weeks before my talk with you on January 3, 1916:

When I talked to the Auditor about the payment of our commissions, he replied by insisting that Mr. Ryan must first pay the taxes. As I understand the situation, there is no question but that Mr. Ryan will pay the taxes, the only question being when he will do so. I further understand that his failure to do so now grows out of the fact that he and his counsel think he will be in a better position to settle with the Board of Supervisors if the State taxes are unpaid.

To this letter I never received any reply whatever. If my understanding of the situation, as stated, had not been correct, and not in accord with Moore's, surely he would have advised me. He has never questioned it to this good minute.

In none of my interviews with Mr. Ryan's counsel was it ever intimated to me that any legislation would be sought for the purpose of relieving Mr. Ryan from any part of the tax due the State.

You will recall, I have no doubt, that you and I had an interview with the Auditor in Richmond, on November 23, 1915, in which you had been placed in a position to make some arrangement with respect to the taxes due, and to the payment of Mr. Drummond's commissions. After we parted at the Auditor's office, I wrote you a letter of that date. To that letter you replied on November 25, stating that your counsel "it best to consult Mr. Ryan's counsel" in respect to the subject matter of my letter.

On December 1 you again wrote me, referring to a phone conversation which, in the meantime, had taken place between us, that you had been unable to get the parties together, but that you hoped to do so within a few days, when you would then more fully answer my letter of November 23.

On December 3 I sent you a telegram urging that some concession in the taxes be reached, and saying, "It is important to me to have the Ryan matter closed immediately," and asking that I be advised of his determination at once.

On December 7 you wired me that you would try at once to make some arrangement that would relieve the situation.

On December 12 you wired me that a conference had been held, but that no conclusion had been reached; that you would have another conference on the 21st, at which it was hoped a decision would be reached.

On December 20 or 21 I cannot now recall which of the two dates is correct, I saw you in Washington, and you were then about to leave for New York to have a conference with Mr. Ryan, and, as you will recall, I intended staying over in Washington until you returned, but was unable to do so, and returned to Lynchburg.

Shortly thereafter, I think about the last of December, I had a phone talk with you, and you made an appointment to meet me at my office on January 1.

On January 1 I received a telegram from you dated Washington, in which you said, "Missed train, will see you to-morrow. Will phone you when I arrive."

You did not reach Lynchburg on the 2d, as indicated by your wire you would do, but on the 2d I received a telegram from you from Appomattox, saying you had to come by Richmond, and would see me either Monday or Tuesday.

On Monday, January 3, you did meet me at my office.

I have recited, in brief, the foregoing details in order that you may see clearly what I had in mind, and what impression our conversation, to which I am about to refer, left upon me.

The one purpose which I had in view

was to ascertain when Mr. Ryan expected to pay the taxes due the State under the assessment of \$50,000,000 made by my client, R. H. Drummond. This was the matter in which I naturally felt the deepest interest, because, as I told you, the Auditor had declined to pay the commissions due to Mr. Drummond before Mr. Ryan had paid the taxes.

You must also bear in mind that at that time I had never received the slightest intimation from any source whatever that any legislation would be asked for Mr. Ryan's relief.

It is true that our conference at my office, on January 3, was quite brief. You simply stated that you had had an interview with Mr. Ryan, or his counsel. I do not recall which, a day or two before, and I asked you when Mr. Ryan would pay, or settle (which word I used I do not recall) the taxes due the State under the Drummond assessment, and you replied that they would be paid, or settled (I do not recall which word you used) within sixty, or in about sixty days. I then asked you if I were at liberty to give that assurance to my client, Mr. Drummond, and you told me that I was.

Acting upon what then seemed to me to be a positive assurance that the entire amount would be paid within the time named, I did so report to my client, and later, in response to a letter which I received from the Attorney General, I so wrote him, as you know.

If I had had the slightest intimation of any proposed legislation on the subject, I might not have construed your statement as I did, and had you known that I had no such knowledge or intimation, I am quite sure that you would have advised me of that fact.

The above is practically all of the conversation we had about the matter because when you made the statement above referred to, I remember that it perfectly satisfactory and settled the matter, and we then proceeded to chat for a little while about matters wholly foreign to the business in hand.

In view of nearly five years of unbroken intimacy and friendship, and of the confidence which I have always had in you, it goes without saying that I accept, absolutely, of any intimation to mislead me.

I can now see what you may have had in mind when you made the statements above referred to, but, on the other hand, I feel you cannot fail to see the impression which they naturally, and almost necessarily, made upon me.

I, of course, know that you did not intend to mislead me, but that I have been misled, and my client's interests greatly prejudiced, is likewise true.

After this conference with you on January 3, I told Mr. Drummond that we could both dismiss the matter from our minds with the assurance, as I honestly believed, that the taxes would be paid within sixty days, and we would receive our commissions. And that time on I paid no further attention to the matter.

(Continued on Fifth Page)

Duffy's Relieved Stomach

Trouble and Indigestion



Geo. M. Mangon.

A newspaper advertisement was the means of acquainting Mr. Mangon with the medicinal virtues of Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey. He says:

"Four years ago I had a bad case of stomach trouble and nervous indigestion. It was impossible to retain any food on my stomach, and my weight dropped from 175 pounds to 106 pounds in two years. I took treatment without success and worried myself to a physical wreck. I noticed your advertisement and decided to purchase a bottle. I took Duffy's as directed, and have been taking it ever since. I have regained my weight and am now a well and powerful man—thanks to your great remedy. I know it saved my life, and I am never without a bottle in the house. I wish you could tell the whole world what Duffy's has done for me!" (Signed) Geo. M. Mangon, 253 Broadway, New York City.

Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey

is recommended in tablespoon doses in equal amounts of water or milk before meals and on retiring as an aid to digestion. Sufferers from stomach trouble and indigestion with sensitive stomachs are able to retain Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey as it is made from health-giving grains thoroughly malted and requiring little effort of the digestive organs. As a household remedy for use in emergencies Duffy's is unsurpassed.



"Get Duffy's and Keep Well"

Sold in SEALED BOTTLES ONLY. Beware of imitations.

Note Get Duffy's from your local druggist, grocer or dealer, \$1.00 per bottle. If he cannot supply you, write us. Send for useful household booklet free.

The Duffy Malt Whiskey Co. Rochester, N. Y.

Brass and Copper Stencils Made in Any Size Steel and Rubber Stamps

Printing

Steel and Copper Engraving

For Prices, See

Reinach & Schwartz
STATIONERS

1311 EAST MAIN STREET.
Phone Madison 5467 for Quick Service.

The Confederate Museum

TWELFTH AND CLAY STREETS
Open 9 A. M. to 5 P. M.
Admission 25c.
Saturday free from 9 to 1.

The Valentine Museum

ELEVENTH AND CLAY STREETS.
Hours 10 A. M. to 5 P. M. Admission 25c.
Free on Saturdays.

Special

This Week

in

Natural

Brown

and

Grey

for

\$21



Special

This Week

in

Natural

Brown

and

Grey

for

\$21

This Carriage in White Enamel, \$23.00

Baby Week at Jurgens

We believe you will not find anywhere a Carriage better designed to protect baby's health than the Jurgens Special Sleeper shown in the picture.

It has 3/4-inch rubber-tired wheels and light and easy springs, which insures baby easy riding. The large, comfortable body gives baby plenty of room to sleep, and there is no bumping to jar his delicate nerves and make him fussy and fretful.

In beauty of design and style this Jurgens Special will compare favorably with any other make Baby Carriage. It is made of whole reed (no split ones), and finish as fine as can be produced.

Come in, for baby's sake, and let our salesman show you the many advantages of the Special.

For the Older Baby See the Sulky

When baby is old enough to sit up, but not strong enough to sit up very long, you will want to get him a Jurgens Sulky. We have them in all sizes and colors.

In a Jurgens Sulky you can take baby with you on all your trips down town. It is a strong, durable carriage, made to stand the wear and tear which a lively youngster will give it; but so light that mother can draw it anywhere without getting tired. Prices from \$2.25 to \$6.50, in natural brown, gray and white.

JURGENS
ADAMS AND BROAD

THE OLDEST HOUSEFURNISHING STORE IN RICHMOND

DANGEROUS CALOMEL IS SELDOM SOLD NOW

Calomel Salivates! It Makes You Sick and You Lose a Day's Work—Dodson's Liver Tone Acts Better Than Calomel and Is Harmless for Men, Women, Children—Read Guarantee!

Every druggist here, yes! your druggist and everybody's druggist has noticed a great falling-off in the sale of calomel. They all give the same reason. Dodson's Liver Tone is taking its place.

"Calomel is dangerous and people know it while Dodson's Liver Tone is safe and gives better results," said a prominent local druggist. Dodson's Liver Tone is personally guaranteed by every druggist. A large family-sized bottle costs only 50 cents and if you find it doesn't take the place of dangerous, salivating calomel you have only to ask for your money back.

Dodson's Liver Tone is a pleasant-tasting, purely vegetable remedy, harmless to both children and adults. Take a spoonful at night and wake up feeling fine, no sick headache, biliousness, ague,

sour stomach or clogged bowels. Dodson's Liver Tone doesn't gripe or cause inconvenience all next day like calomel.